



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,790	08/18/2003	Takehiko Murakami	U06-045	3697

7590 08/24/2005

COLEMAN SUDOL SAPONE, P.C.
PATENT, TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT MATTERS
714 COLORADO AVENUE
BRIDGEPORT, CT 06605-1601

EXAMINER

CHIN, RANDALL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1744

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/642,790

Applicant(s)

MURAKAMI, TAKEHIKO

Examiner

Randall Chin

Art Unit

1744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification is replete with awkward recitations and grammatically improper phrases. Applicant's cooperation is respectfully requested in reviewing and amending the application to ensure the use of proper idiomatic English. Some examples are:

On p. 1, second paragraph, "and be left there" is awkwardly written. Also, "it is necessary to stop an operation of the machine and clean the mask frequently" is awkwardly written.

On p. 1, third paragraph, "and the cleaning work is a manual work" is awkwardly written.

On p. 2, first paragraph, "...and wiping up without strongly rubbing" is awkwardly written. Also, third paragraph, "the whole of the problems" is awkwardly written. In the fifth paragraph, "in a state of setting" is awkwardly written.

On p. 3, first full paragraph, It appears "clearing unit" should read --cleaning unit--. In the "BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS" section for Figs. 2 and 3, "showing enlargedly" is an awkwardly phrase.

On p. 4, the use of the term "enlargedly" is awkward.

On p. 6, third paragraph, it appears "till" should read --until--.

On p. 7, first paragraph, "may be finished only one time" is awkwardly written. In the second paragraph, "having the low viscosity" is awkwardly written. Also in the second paragraph, "the whole of the problems" is awkward.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 1, it appears "of a screen mask" should read --for a screen mask-- for clarity.

Line 2, it is suggested to change "constituted by" to --comprising-- or --including--.

Line 3, "in a state of setting" is awkwardly written.

Line 9, "clearing unit" should read--cleaning unit--.

Lines 12-13, "the roll-shaped" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Line 21, it appears the term "cleaning" be deleted here for clarity and consistency.

Line 22, "till" should read --until--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett 6,036,787 (hereinafter Bennett '787).

As well as claim 1 is understood, Bennett '787 discloses a cleaning apparatus 10 in Fig. 3 for a screen mask (col. 1, lines 4-10) comprising a cleaning unit which includes a sheet or "tape" 1 which is brought into contact with a lower face of a screen mask 14 (Fig. 7) in a state of setting the sheet upward, a take-up body 21 which is rotated at a predetermined speed by a rotation driving source 37 (col. 4, lines 9-11) and takes up the sheet in the reverse direction to a moving direction of the cleaning unit and at a predetermined speed in correspondence to a moving speed of the cleaning unit, a supply roll or delivery body 3 which holds the roll-shaped "tape" and delivers the tape to the take-up body 21, and a tape pressing table defined by adapter 20 (Figs. 3 and 7) which is arranged between the take-up body and tape delivery body and is in slidable contact with a lower face of the tape so as to press the tape to the lower face of the screen mask (col. 4, lines 27-29 and 56-58), wherein the cleaning unit is structured (through carriage 29 shown in Fig. 7) such as to be moved upward at a starting end position, be moved horizontally until a terminal end position, be moved downward at the terminal end position and be returned to the starting end position (see arrows 31, 33 in Figs. 7, 8a, 8b; col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 19). As for the "tape" being adhesive, it is well within the level of competence of one skilled in the art to have modified Bennett's "tape" such that it is adhesive in form and exhibits tack in order to attract and more efficiently retain more debris from the screen mask, particularly in view of the fact that Bennett's cleaning sheet or "tape" 1 must be designed to trap and retain debris in the first place (col. 4, lines 47-55).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references to Japan '681, Tawara and Miyawaki are relevant to take-up and adhesive roll arrangements.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to Randall Chin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1270. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the Examiner are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, John Kim, can be reached at (571) 272-1142. The number for Technology Center 1700 is (571) 272-1700.

The central fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 1744

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



R. Chin



Randall Chin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1744